



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/607,618   | 06/27/2003  | Otti Markki          | 4208-4139           | 8020             |
| 27123  | 7590        | 10/09/2008           |                     |                  |
| MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.<br>3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER<br>NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101 |             |                      |                     |                  |
| EXAMINER   |             |                      |                     |                  |
| MEUCCL, MICHAEL D  |             |                      |                     |                  |
| ART UNIT   |             | PAPER NUMBER         |                     |                  |
| 2442   |             |                      |                     |                  |
| NOTIFICATION DATE  |             | DELIVERY MODE        |                     |                  |
| 10/09/2008   |             | ELECTRONIC           |                     |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOPatentCommunications@Morganfinnegan.com

Shopkins@Morganfinnegan.com

jmedina@Morganfinnegan.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/607,618

**Applicant(s)**

MARKKI ET AL.

**Examiner**

MICHAEL D. MEUCCI

**Art Unit**

2142

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-6, 8-33, 35-37 and 39-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-6, 8-33, 35-37 and 39-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed on 27 August 2008.
2. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-33, 35-37, and 39-62 remain pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-15, 32, 33, 35-37, 39-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reilly et al. (U.S. 5,740,549) hereinafter referred to as Reilly in view of Husain et al. (U.S. 7,430,616 B2) hereinafter referred to as Husain.

a. As per claims 1 and 32, Reilly teaches: providing to said user, in accordance with one or more specified criteria, one or more notifications corresponding to one or more events known by a node of said user, wherein each of said notifications describes one or more of said events, wherein the notifications had previously been moving while a user interface of said node displayed a screensaver (line 65 of column 9 through line 9 of column 10); and enabling said user to select, via the non-moving display, one or more of the notifications for activating corresponding operations (lines 3-8 of column 13).

Reilly does not explicitly teach: wherein said events correspond to one or more messages received from a first node to be passed through to a second node. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize the advantage of having not only email messages, advertising, display script, and software updates provided to the user, but also messages such as chat messages provided to the user. Hussein adds: "The portable message may be sent from the first computer system to a second computer system using peer-to-peer message passing between the first computer system, the second computer system, and optionally one or more intermediary computer systems. After being received at the second computer system, the portable message may be routed using DCI to an appropriate target application based on the metadata," (lines 50-57 of column 2). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have said events correspond to one or more messages received from a first node to be passed through to a second node. "In one embodiment, DCI may include small, network-unaware applications called "peerlets." Peerlets may be suitable for applications including chat, shared whiteboard, and other collaborative applications. A peerlet on a first computer system may generate a message (including collaborative data such as chat text or whiteboard graphics) and send the message to the distributed computing infrastructure using an API," (lines 58-64 of column 2 in Husain). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have said events correspond to one or more messages received from a first node to be passed through to a second node in the system as taught by Reilly.

b. As per claims 2 and 33, Reilly teaches: one or more of said events relate to software accessible by said node (lines 55-60 of column 14).

c. As per claims 4 and 35, Reilly teaches: one or more of said messages correspond to one or more entities (line 65 of column 9 through line 4 of column 10).

d. As per claims 5 and 36, Reilly does not explicitly teach one or more of said messages correspond to chat. However, Husain discloses: "Peerlets may be suitable for applications including chat, shared whiteboard, and other collaborative applications. A peerlet on a first computer system may generate a message (including collaborative data such as chat text or whiteboard graphics) and send the message to the distributed computing infrastructure using an API," (lines 59-64 of column 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have messages corresponding to chat. "The portable message may then be sent from the first computer system to a second computer system using peer-to-peer message passing between the first computer system, the second computer system, and optionally one or more intermediary computer systems," (lines 2-6 of column 3 in Husain). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have one or more of said messages correspond to chat in the system as taught by Reilly.

e. As per claims 6 and 37, Reilly teaches: two or more of said notifications are displayed simultaneously to said user (line 65 of column 9 through line 9 of column 10).

f. As per claims 8 and 39, Reilly teaches: one or more of said notifications are textual notifications (line 65 of column 9 through line 9 of column 10).

g. As per claims 9 and 40, Reilly teaches: one or more of said notifications are graphical notifications (line 65 of column 9 through line 9 of column 10 and Fig. 6).

h. As per claims 10 and 41, Reilly teaches: said criteria are provided by said user (lines 37-45 of column 9).

i. As per claims 11 and 42, Reilly teaches: criteria provided by a system administrator (lines 36-45 of column 6).

j. As per claims 12 and 43, Reilly does not explicitly teach: one or more of said criteria are metadata. However, Husain discloses: "The portable message may include metadata which comprise identifying characteristics of the source application," (lines 48-50 of column 2). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have one or more of said criteria as metadata. "After being received at the second computer system, the portable message may be routed using DCI to an appropriate target application based on the metadata," (lines 54-57 of column 2 in Husain). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have one or more of said criteria as metadata in the system as taught by Reilly.

k. As per claims 13, 14, 44, and 45, Reilly teaches: scrolling notifications and three-dimensional scrolling (lines 41-45 of column 9).

I. As per claims 15 and 46, Reilly teaches: activating software corresponding to a selected notification (lines 9-15 of column 13).

5. Claims 16 and 47 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reilly and Husain as applied to claims 1 and 32 respectively, in view of Wong et al. (U.S. 5,542,115) hereinafter referred to as Wong.

Reilly does not explicitly teach providing a tactile indication to said user. However, Wong discloses: "if pager unit 22 is in a vibrate mode, microprocessor 80 outputs a signal which causes I/O interface 86 to issue a further signal to activate vibrator 95 (step 322)," (lines 58-61 of column 7)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to provide a tactile indication to said user. "Notification to the user (either via beeper 94 and/or vibrator 95)" is the motivation for the addition of a tactile indication (lines 65-66 of column 7). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to provide a tactile indication to said user in the system as taught by Reilly.

6. Claims 17-30 and 48-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reilly in view of Husain, and Lagimonier et al. (US PG Pub. 2003/0041265 A1) hereinafter referred to as Lagimonier.

a. As per claims 17, 29, 48, and 60, Reilly teaches: memory, processor, and program code (inherent in computerized system); receiving from one of said nodes, one

or more messages (line 65 of column 9 through line 9 of column 10); providing to said user a display of one or more notifications corresponding to one or more of said messages wherein each of the messages to which said notifications correspond matches one or more specified criteria, wherein each of said notifications describes one or more of messages to which said notifications correspond (line 65 of column 9 through line 9 of column 10); maintaining, receiving, and displaying are performed while a user interface of said node is displaying a screensaver (line 65 of column 9 through line 9 of column 10); providing to said user a non-moving display of one or more of the notifications (line 65 of column 9 through line 9 of column 10); and wherein the notifications had previously been moving while a user interface of said node displayed a screensaver (line 65 of column 9 through line 9 of column 10).

Reilly does not explicitly teach: maintaining a number of authenticated connections to one or more nodes in said peer-to-peer environment; and the message is to be passed through to a second of said nodes.

Lagimonier discloses: "Yet another aspect of the present invention provides for a system for processing messages in a peer-to-peer configuration. The system comprises a first peer configured to provide secure communication, a second peer configured to provide secure communication, and a secure communication module, where the secure communication module is configured to be executed by the first peer and second peer," (paragraph [0015] on page 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to maintain a number of authenticated connections to one or more nodes in said peer-to-peer environment.



"The secure communication module is configured to compare the nonce value to a filter in response to a nonce value of a received packet not exceeding a largest nonce value yet seen and the secure communication module is also configured to compare the nonce value to a replay mask. The secure communication module is further configured to accept the received packet in response to the comparison of the nonce value and the replay mask being false," (paragraph [0015] on page 2 in Lagimonier). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to maintain a number of authenticated connections to one or more nodes in said peer-to-peer environment in the system as taught by Reilly.

Husain discloses: "The portable message may be sent from the first computer system to a second computer system using peer-to-peer message passing between the first computer system, the second computer system, and optionally one or more intermediary computer systems. After being received at the second computer system, the portable message may be routed using DCI to an appropriate target application based on the metadata," (lines 50-57 of column 2). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to pass the message through to a second of said nodes. "In one embodiment, DCI may include small, network-unaware applications called "peerlets." Peerlets may be suitable for applications including chat, shared whiteboard, and other collaborative applications. A peerlet on a first computer system may generate a message (including collaborative data such as chat text or whiteboard graphics) and send the message to the distributed computing infrastructure using an API," (lines 58-64 of column 2 in Husain). It is for this

reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to pass the message through to a second of said nodes in the system as taught by Reilly.

b. As per claims 18 and 49, Reilly teaches one or more of the received messages correspond to one or more entities (line 65 of column 9 through line 4 of column 10).

c. As per claims 19 and 50, Reilly does not explicitly teach one or more of said messages correspond to chat. However, Husain discloses: "Peerlets may be suitable for applications including chat, shared whiteboard, and other collaborative applications. A peerlet on a first computer system may generate a message (including collaborative data such as chat text or whiteboard graphics) and send the message to the distributed computing infrastructure using an API," (lines 59-64 of column 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have messages corresponding to chat. "The portable message may then be sent from the first computer system to a second computer system using peer-to-peer message passing between the first computer system, the second computer system, and optionally one or more intermediary computer systems," (lines 2-6 of column 3 in Husain). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have one or more of said messages correspond to chat in the system as taught by Reilly.

d. As per claims 20 and 51, Reilly teaches: two or more of said notifications are displayed simultaneously to said user (line 65 of column 9 through line 4 of column 10).

e. As per claims 21 and 52, Reilly teaches: wherein displaying is via a screensaver (line 65 of column 9 through line 4 of column 10).

e. As per claims 22 and 53, Reilly teaches: one or more of said notifications are textual notifications (line 65 of column 9 through line 4 of column 10).

f. As per claims 23 and 54, Reilly teaches: one or more of said notifications are graphical notifications (line 65 of column 9 through line 4 of column 10 and Fig. 6).

g. As per claims 24 and 55, Reilly teaches: said criteria are provided by said user (line 65 of column 9 through line 4 of column 10 and Fig. 6).

h. As per claims 25 and 56, Reilly teaches: criteria are provided by a system administrator (lines 36-45 of column 6).

i. As per claims 26 and 57, Reilly does not explicitly teach: one or more of said criteria are metadata. However, Husain discloses: "The portable message may include metadata which comprise identifying characteristics of the source application," (lines 48-50 of column 2). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have one or more of said criteria as metadata. "After being received at the second computer system, the portable message may be routed using DCI to an appropriate target application based on the metadata," (lines 54-57 of column 2 in Husain). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have one or more of said criteria as metadata in the system as taught by Reilly.

j. As per claims 27, 28, 58, and 59, Reilly teaches: scrolling notifications and three-dimensional scrolling (lines 41-45 of column 9).

k. As per claims 30 and 61, Reilly teaches: activating software corresponding to a selected notification (lines 55-60 of column 14).

7. Claims 31 and 62 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reilly, Husain and Lagimonier as applied to claims 17 and 48 respectively, further in view of Wong.

Skladman does not explicitly teach providing a tactile indication to said user. However, Wong discloses: "if pager unit 22 is in a vibrate mode, microprocessor 80 outputs a signal which causes I/O interface 86 to issue a further signal to activate vibrator 95 (step 322)," (lines 58-61 of column 7)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to provide a tactile indication to said user. "Notification to the user (either via beeper 94 and/or vibrator 95)" is the motivation for the addition of a tactile indication (lines 65-66 of column 7). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to provide a tactile indication to said user in the system as taught by Skladman and Lagimonier.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments filed 27 August 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

9. (A) The applicant provided no arguments against the examiner's rejections and amended the independent claims. New grounds of rejection regarding the amended claims are provided above.

***Conclusion***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Meucci at (571) 272-3892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell, can be reached at (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for this Group is 571-273-8300.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [michael.meucci@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35

U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Andrew Caldwell/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2142